



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,532	10/26/2001	Chia-Pin Chiu	42390P5593C	3453

7590 12/31/2003
Brent E. Vecchia
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

FLANIGAN, ALLEN J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3753

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/007,532

Applicant(s)

CHIU, CHIA-PIN

Examiner

Allen J. Flanigan

Art Unit

3753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received:
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 3753

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 8-19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 5, and 6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,315,038. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are broader than the patent claims (they do not limit the thermal interface to a "solid layer", and they do not require the cooling device be attached "via the adhesive" (claims 8 & 15) "to the thermal interface layer at the first surface" (claim 8)). The current claims can thus be said to "dominate" the patent claims. When the claims of the patent expire, any member of the public attempting to make the claimed invention would be infringing the claims of the instant application. This represents an unlawful extension of patent monopoly.

Regarding claims 10, 11, 18, and 19, these claims merely recite a notoriously well-known feature, i.e. both heat sinks and thermal plates are commonly attached to components needing to be cooled by means of thermal interfaces, and citation of a reference to such effect is deemed unnecessary. ***In re Malcolm*, 54 U.S.P.Q. 235.**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-12, 15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamagata.

Yamagata provides thermal connection between a cooling device (package 3 with attached heat sink 9) and a device to be cooled (chip 5, which may be a CPU for example) by applying an adhesive 2 to a thermal interface (wiring board 6) outside a heat transfer area (note that highly thermally conductive adhesive material 1 occupies what can be considered the “heat transfer area”), see bridging sentence of columns 5-6. The thermal interface (wiring board 6) is attached to package 3, and the chip 5 is attached to the wiring board. Regarding claims 3, 4, 10, and 11, the heat sink 9 of Yamagata is equally readable on the claimed “heat sink” or “thermal plate”. Note that Yamagata

even refers to it as a "radiation plate". Regarding claim 6, note that adhesive 2 is clearly shown to be applied at the periphery of wiring board 6.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 9, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata in view of Todman.

Yamagata indicates that adhesive 2 is a low elasticity adhesive agent "such as silicone rubber-series adhesive". There is no express indication of whether this adhesive is pressure sensitive; however the disclosure does indicate that the "wiring board . . . is mounted on the inner bottom surface of the package 3 and fixed thereon by heating and pressing the adhesive agent" (top column 6). Further, silicone rubber adhesives are one known type of PSA; see lines 17-20 of column 3 of Todman. Thus, even assuming the silicone rubber adhesive taught in Yamagata is not one that can be considered pressure sensitive, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to use a pressure sensitive silicone rubber adhesive, particularly since a pressing step is employed to attach the wiring board to the package.

Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Baska et al. shows a combination of thermally conductive interface material and adhesive applied between a heat sink and a component or housing.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen J. Flanigan whose telephone number is (703) 308-1015. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Scherbel can be reached on (703) 308-1272. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7764.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.


Allen J. Flanigan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3753